

**MSR Stakeholder Working Group**  
Los Alamitos/Seal Beach/Rossmoor/Sunset Beach Focus Area  
November 18, 2004

Meeting Minutes  
(Approved 12/16/04)

**I. Call to Order:**

The meeting began shortly after 6:00 pm. All stakeholders were in attendance, except Nick Rini (Public Representative for Seal Beach) and Henry Taboada (City Manager for Los Alamitos).

Facilitator apologized to working group for her late arrival to the October meeting and asked if there were any changes to the October minutes. WG member commented on concerns with WG's role and the process. Facilitator responded that these concerns will be addressed later in the meeting. LAFCO staff clarified if there were any changes to the minutes. WG responded with no changes.

Decision Point – Draft Minutes for October 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting – Adopted by consensus

Facilitator asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak.

Eric Christensen, a resident of Rossmoor, provided a hand-out summarizing his concerns as a resident about the MSR stakeholder working group process. He stated that he had expressed concern before to the stakeholder working group about its failure to look at all of the potential alternatives and opportunities for the MSR area regardless of whether some of these opportunities are controversial or politically infeasible. He reminded the group that he has not received the financial information for each agency that he previously requested. Mr. Christensen specifically asked how the working group could not look at the existence of the special districts that are within the MSR area, especially since LAFCO has specific authority to reorganize the special districts. He added that the working group should also look at annexation of Rossmoor to Los Alamitos and Seal Beach. He closed with saying that he was disappointed that the working group is not addressing a full range of opportunities for the MSR area and believes the group is not fulfilling its responsibilities.

Facilitator stated that many of Mr. Christensen's concerns may be addressed through the remaining meeting discussions and/or final LAFCO MSR Report.

**II. Review Agenda and Desired Outcomes**

Facilitator explained the order of the meeting and outlined the meeting's desired outcomes. She stated that Bob Aldrich, LAFCO staff, will first present a summary review of the working group's previous actions.

A working group member posed the following questions regarding the MSR process:

- What's the end product?
- Will a vision plan be adopted for each agency or will there be one common vision plan?

- How does the vision plan fit in with the LAFCO MSR report?

Bob Aldrich responded that if his presentation did not address those questions clearly, he would provide further clarification after the presentation.

A working group member stated that the role of the working group needs to be clarified. WG member questioned whether the role of the group is to support or identify options for maintaining the quality of life for the area and expressed concern that the group is not looking at the full range of options for the area. WG member asked if the options could be changed at this point.

Facilitator responded that the group could revisit any of their options as the vision plan belongs to the group and needs to reflect its thinking; however, the group must reach whatever options it chooses by consensus as this is the ground rule it agreed to operate by.

### **III. Summary Review of Working Group Planning Decisions and Priorities**

Bob Aldrich presented a review of the working group's planning process and its decisions regarding issues, challenges and opportunities for the MSR area.

Mr. Aldrich stated that the following represented the milestones of planning decisions and priorities set by the working group for the MSR area:

#### Issues, Challenges, and Concerns – identified by the WG on February 17, 2004

- Financial Stability
- Self Governance
- Services: Public Safety, Schools, Parks and Recreation
- Quality of Life: Independence, Identity

#### Quality of Life (QOL) Definitions – adopted by the WG on March 24, 2004

##### **Quantifiable QOL**

- Fiscal Viability of Service Providers
- Parks, Schools, Coastal Areas, Housing
- Public Services
- Mobility
- Commercial Areas

##### **Non-Quantifiable QOL**

- Feel of Area
  - Small Town
  - Family-Oriented
- Increased Access to Governance
  - Ordinary Person can be Heard

■ Self-Determination, Empowerment

- People of all ages feel safe and comfortable walking the streets and using parks.
- Buildings, businesses and homes reflect a distinctive charm that help maintain a unique identity and feel of a small town.
- Community activities compatible with family values and lifestyles.
- Area is clean, well maintained and attractive.
- Goods and services are available in the immediate area and access to all modes of transportation is maintained.
- Residents are empowered; residents experience their governing bodies as accessible, responsive and honest.

Macro Issues and Data Needs – directed LAFCO staff to collect trending data for specific issues

- Equity of Public Services
- Infrastructure
- Governance – Areas of Mutual Interest
- Fiscal Health of Agencies
- Public Safety
- Demographics
- Transportation

Gaps, Challenges, and Opportunities – identified by the WG on June 15, 2004

- Lack of Funding for Cities/Counties
- Maintaining Existing Quality of Life
- Enhanced City/Community Coordination
  - water, sewer, public safety, recreation, land use, transportation
- Leadership
- Maintaining Distinct Identities
- Autonomy of Unincorporated Areas

Mr. Aldrich added that during this meeting these gaps and challenges were identified as being either fiscal or governance-related.

Potential Alternatives to Gaps, Challenges and Opportunities – identified by the WG on June 15, 2004

- Consolidation of Services
  - Joint Powers Authorities (JPAs)
  - Community Services Districts (CSDs)
- Outside the Box
  - Borough
  - Special legislation

Additional Alternatives that may be explored by LAFCO

- Formation of a single city
- Annexation of unincorporated areas to adjacent cities
- Incorporation of unincorporated areas

Mr. Aldrich revisited the questions asked earlier by WG member. WG member responded that questions had been answered through the presentation.

Walter Kieser, managing principal from the consulting firm Economic & Planning Systems, commented to the question posed earlier by WG member about changing the options to be included in the vision plan. He added that the document adopted by the working group should be reflective of the group's interests. He added that the vision plan should be a policy document that may include several appendices. Mr. Kieser further added that the LAFCO MSR report and the vision plan should be parallel, with the MSR report being the more technical document and the vision plan representing what the MSR community wants.

WG member asked should the options the WG is looking at be short-term. Mr. Kieser responded that the options, whether short-term or not, should be derived from a screening process which began during the October meeting.

#### **IV. Review Vision Plan Alternatives**

Walter Kieser presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the options/alternatives identified by WG during the October meeting.

Mr. Kieser explained the potential services a CSD in Sunset Beach could provide:

1. Form a Community Services District (CSD)  
in Sunset Beach
  - Parking regulations and related enforcement
  - Road and drainage maintenance
  - Parks and recreation programs
  - Enhanced law enforcement
  - Beach maintenance
  - Landscape maintenance

WG member asked for further detail on enhanced law enforcement. Mr. Kieser explained the option in further detail and referenced an example used in Contra Costa.

WG member asked if Mr. Kieser looked at the planning option through a CSD as requested by the group at last meeting. Mr. Kieser responded that the absence of this option in the presentation was an oversight and responded that a CSD could contract to provide planning services. He added that this function could be delegated by the County to other jurisdictions and any powers that the CSD takes on will need to be considered and approved by LAFCO.

2. Activate latent powers of the Rossmoor CSD
  - Road and drainage maintenance
  - Parks and recreation programs
  - Landscape maintenance
  - Enhanced law enforcement

Mr. Kieser defined the function and process for a JPA:

3. Establish a JPA
  - Landscape maintenance
  - Recreation programs
  - Road and drainage maintenance
  - Law enforcement

WG member asked about the life of a JPA. Mr. Kieser responded that JPAs are contractual and these specific arrangements define their duration.

Mr. Kieser added that another option the WG may consider is the formation of a governance council which could be a tool for making planning decisions for the area. He added that the Governance Council may include representatives from the respective agencies and communities.

Facilitator led the group in a discussion of the alternatives presented by EPS.

Facilitator asked if there are other concepts that the WG wanted to consider and/or include in the vision plan. WG members suggested that the following also be included:

1. Incorporation of Rossmoor

WG member added that this option should be included in the vision plan along with a discussion of whether it's feasible or not, and if not, a discussion of why it's infeasible. WG member suggested that another term be used in place of *infeasible*.

2. Annexation of Rossmoor

WG member suggested that a narrative be added to the incorporation and annexation discussions that clearly states the cities' position that they are not interested in incorporation and/or annexation and from their perspective these options are "non-starters" for the cities and that residents must initiate these options if they want them.

WG member expressed opposition to including these options in vision plan.

Facilitator responded that the vision plan will first be distributed to the WG in "draft" form and changes could still be made if the vision plan is not acceptable to all WG members.

Facilitator asked Mr. Kieser to provide further detail on the concept of a local entity to address planning responsibilities as a possible alternative. Mr. Kieser explained the function of a potential local planning authority as an option. He stated how this could be handled through a governance council who could address issues of common interest to multiple agencies.

The working group took a break.

## V. Adopt Vision Plan Alternatives

After resuming meeting, facilitator asked for consensus on the draft alternatives and additional concepts to be included in the vision plan. She reminded the group that the vision plan will be distributed in draft form through which changes could still be made. The WG added the governance council and planning options to the alternatives.

Decision Point – Draft Alternatives to be Included in Vision Plan – **Adopted by consensus**

## VI. Adopt Vision Plan Format

Facilitator asked if there were any comments or changes to the draft vision plan format distributed at the last meeting. LAFCO staff stated that they had received two comments that have been addressed earlier during the meeting. WG member suggested that the wording be changed in VI, B to reflect "...Strategies and Opportunities *Identified* by WG" instead of ".....*Adopted* by WG." WG member stated that items listed under VI, B (2) had not been discussed in detail by WG. WG member suggested that we remove these items.

Decision Point – Draft Vision Plan Format with changes – **Adopted by consensus**

## VII. Review Timeline and Next Steps

Facilitator reviewed the tentative timeline for the remainder of the MSR process. LAFCO staff explained their timeline for preparation and distribution of the MSR report.

- 12/03/04 LAFCO distributes draft Vision Plan to WG for comment and gathering community comment
- 12/14/04 WG discuss and adopt Vision Plan
- 2/2/05 LAFCO distributes MSR report to Commission and WG for comment
- 2/2 to 2/25 Optional WG meeting (**Determine if WG wants to meet again as a group to discuss MSR report**)
- 2/9/05 First Commission reading of Vision Plan/MSR
- 3/9/05 Commission public hearing for MSR

WG member asked for clarification on timeline for presenting vision plan to respective agencies and communities. LAFCO staff responded that WG members could begin presenting vision plan to respective agencies and communities after adoption by the working group at the next meeting. LAFCO added that staff would need any written comments that any WG member would like to be included in the MSR report to the Commission prior to the Commission meeting; however, comments (written or verbal) can be presented to the Commission up to the closing of the Commission hearing.

Facilitator stated that the next meeting would take place on December 14<sup>th</sup>. Some WG members expressed that they had conflicts on this date. December 16<sup>th</sup> was offered up as an alternative

date. All WG members concurred that they could attend and meeting was changed from December 14<sup>th</sup> to December 16<sup>th</sup>.

Facilitator stated that there is an opportunity for an optional WG meeting in February to discuss the MSR report. WG decided that they would revisit scheduling the optional meeting if necessary.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15p.m.